

## Remarks

### Rejection of Claims 1-11

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, and 8-11 for statutory double patenting under 35 U.S.C. § 101 with respect to United States patent number 6,650,445 issued to Witte et al, hereinafter referred to as Witte. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 5-7 for non-statutory obviousness type double patenting under 35 U.S.C. § 101 with respect to Witte. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, and 6 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by United States patent number 6,178,015 issued to Lee et al, hereinafter referred to as Lee. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 6 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by United States patent number 5,822,052 issued to Tsai, hereinafter referred to as Tsai. The Examiner has rejected claim 7 as obvious under U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee and what the Examiner contends is well known prior art. The Examiner has rejected claim 7 as obvious under U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Tsai and what the Examiner contends is well known prior art.

The Applicants have canceled claims 1-11 rendering all the rejections of these claims moot. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all of the rejections of claims 1-11.


### Allowed Claims 12-22

The Examiner has allowed claims 12-22. The Applicants have amended claims to more particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-22 are still in a condition for allowance.

### Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully contend that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Stephen B. Witte et al

By   
Gregg W. Wisdom  
Reg. No. 40,231

March 3, 2006  
(360) 212-8052